

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action issued March 2, 2009, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,774,887 (“Wolff”) in view of Batres, U.S. Patent No. 6,832,351 (“Batres”).

Claims 1-15 are now pending in this application. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to clarify the subject matter that the Applicant considers to be the invention. No new matter has been added.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-15 are not unpatentable over Wolff in view of Batres because the combination of Wolff and Batres does not disclose or suggest causing the data entry form to be displayed on a display in accordance with the stored attribute data but not initially displaying a value and into which a user enters a value, and for monitoring data values entered by the user into said at least one data entry field, and, in response to entry by the user of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying in said data entry form in addition to said at least one data entry field the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, as required by claim 1 and similar requirement of claim 3. The combination of Wolff and Batres only discloses displaying the same data entry fields regardless of the data value entered into a data entry field.

Wolff discloses, in Fig. 2, a task object 60 that includes a plurality of slots 60c-60g that contain pointer to the individual forms that need to be filled out by a customer service representative to complete a task. (See col. 6, lines 46-55) Wolff further discloses

that each task object includes a pointer to each form object (forms 1-7) that is required to complete a task, and that the forms that need to be filled out for a given task are determined when the form generating system is set up. (See col. 6, lines 64-67) In Fig. 6, Wolff shows a task map 386 that displays a list of forms that the user needs to fill out. The current form that the user is filling in is indicated. This task map 386 does not disclose or suggest causing the data entry form to be displayed on a display in accordance with the stored attribute data but not initially displaying a value and into which a user enters a value, as is required by claims 1 and 3. Wolff further does not disclose or suggest that selection by the user of a different form using task map 386 causes displaying in said data entry form in addition to said at least one data entry field the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, as is required by claims 1 and 3. Although Form 2 shown in Fig. 6 does display fields to be filled in, Wolff does not disclose or suggest monitoring data values entered by the user into these fields. Wolff further does not disclose or suggest in response to entry by the user of a value into these fields, displaying in said data entry form in addition to said at least one data entry field the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields.

Batres discloses a blank control 102 that, when invoked by a template data control 134, generates a query to obtain customer name data based on the current recordset and displayed. The remaining blank controls 104-120 similarly obtain, fill in, and display the

appropriate data in text or other form. A signal control may retrieve information for other controls and pass that information to the other controls for display. Examples of such information include customer name, address and telephone number, which are passed to the controls related to name data, address data, and telephone number data. (*See* Batres col. 6, line 56 to col. 7, line 8) Batres discloses retrieving particular data values for entry and display in the controls, not displaying in said data entry form in addition to said at least one data entry field the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, as is required by claims 1 and 3.

Even if Wolff and Batres were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the resulting combination still would not disclose or suggest displaying in said data entry form in addition to said at least one data entry field the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, as is required by claims 1 and 3.

Therefore, claims 1 and 3, and claims 2 and 4-15, which depend therefrom, are not unpatentable over Wolff in view of Batres.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4545 (5231-051-US01).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Michael A. Schwartz, #40,161/

Michael A. Schwartz
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: June 2, 2009

Hanify & King, P.C.
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 403-2103 Tel.
(202) 429-4380 Fax